Pima Community College
April 29 - May 1, 2007

Review Team Members

Dr. Ray Buss, chairperson, State Institution of Higher Education

Dr. Deborah Heiberger, Private Institution of Higher Education

Dr. Jacob Chavez, K-12 Administration

Linda Thieken, Arizona Education Association

Rosemary Gaona, National Board Certified Teacher

Patty Hardy, Arizona Department of Education

Diane Abel, Community College

Arizona Department of Education
1535 W. Jefferson
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Arizona State Board rule R7-2-604(A) states: The Board shall evaluate and may approve the professional preparation programs which request Board Approval. Rules R7-2-604 and R7-2-604.01 apply to all professional preparation programs in teacher, administrator, school guidance counselor, and school psychology programs that lead to certification.   The findings and recommendations described in this document are based on Step 1 and Step 2 program documentation as well as the observations and subsequent evaluations by site visit team members. Findings are provided relative to each program reviewed along with a recommendation for State Board of Education action.

Based upon the recommendations of the Review Team, the Board may grant program approval for a period not to exceed five years. A copy of Board rules governing the Professional Preparation Approval Process is included as an addendum to this document.

The professional preparation program review for Pima Community college was conducted on April 29-May 1, 2007. The following programs were submitted for review:

- Post–Baccalaureate Teacher Certification Program Secondary Education
- Post–Baccalaureate Teacher Certification Program Elementary Education
- Post–Baccalaureate Teacher Certification Program Dual Certification Elementary/Special Education Cross-categorical
- Post–Baccalaureate Teacher Certification Program Dual Certification Elementary/Learning Disability
- Post–Baccalaureate Teacher Certification Program Dual Certification Secondary Education/Cross-categorical
- Post–Baccalaureate Teacher Certification Program Dual Certification Secondary Education/Learning Disability

Pima Community College withdrew the original submissions for Dual Certification Elementary/Special Education Cross-categorical, Dual Certification Elementary/Learning Disability, Dual Certification Secondary Education/Cross-categorical, and Dual Certification Secondary Education/Learning Disability and submitted a revised proposal on May 11, 2007. The two programs submitted for review on May 11, 2007 were Special Education Cross-categorical Teacher Certification and Special Education Learning Disabilities Teacher Certification. A follow-up meeting was held with three review team members and Dr. Cynthia McCafferty, Cynthia Yrun-Calenti and Brian Nelson from Pima Community College on June 7, 2007 to review continued concerns. The final program submission for Special Education Cross-categorical Teacher Certification and Special Education Learning Disabilities Teacher Certification was submitted to the Arizona Department of Education on July 11, 2007 via email from Dr. Cynthia McCafferty.

The review team expresses its appreciation to the faculty for their work in preparation for the visit. The faculty and staff were very cooperative with the team throughout the visit. The team further expresses appreciation for the hospitality shown them on the Pima Community College site visit.

The Arizona State Board of Education and the Arizona Department of Education regard the approval process as a collaborative endeavor to maintain, improve, and ensure educator preparation quality in Arizona. The on-site visits are an important part of that process. Following are the findings of the review team along with the list of exhibits and interviews used for reaching the conclusions.

PROFESSIONAL COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS (COMMON THREADS)

The Post-Degree Certification Program coursework is offered in an accelerated format which incorporates State and National standards as well as the latest research on effective learning, with an emphasis on Constructivism as a theory of learning to scaffold course materials and instructional delivery. The application of coursework is emphasized through focused field experiences.

Courses are offered online, exclusively, as on spring 2007.

The program is generally delivered through six-week accelerated sessions throughout the calendar year.

Pima Community College has provided a familiar and consistent web environment for all courses which provides ease of navigation for students and faculty throughout online coursework.

Instructors communicate with their students through a variety of means, including face-to-face, telephone, email, online discussions, online feedback on assignments, online office hours and live chat space. The review team found the depth of interpersonal connections between the faculty and students in the delivery of online instruction to be impressive. A faculty member reported, "A student who prefers face-to-face classroom interaction was surprised at the amount of personal contact." The online environment is found to be encouraging to shy and reticent students, according to faculty and student interviews.

The course template is standardized and includes such items as performance objectives, topics, assignments, and related artifacts. This promotes consistency in the delivery of course materials and expectations. According to faculty interviews, individual instructors still have the latitude to meet the expressed needs of students so that student needs continue to inform instruction.

A general environment has been created to react quickly to program needs based on student feedback. Faculty stated that changes in course materials were adjusted rapidly based on student feedback. One faculty member stated during the interviews, "We consistently get student input and we really listen to that."

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: Post Baccaalaureate Teacher Certification Program Secondary Education

Post-Baccalaureate Teacher Certification Program Elementary Education

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The Pima Community College Post Degree Teacher Education Program provides students the academic and practical skills needed to become certified K-12 teachers. The Secondary program offers coursework in an accelerated format which incorporates both State and National Standards as well as the latest research on effective teaching. Courses are offered in the evening, online and on week-ends. Prior to the site visit, Pima Community College notified the Arizona Department of Education that all courses are offered online, exclusively, as of Spring 2007.

The Elementary and Secondary Teacher Certification programs consist of a common core of coursework. These courses include:

EDU 268	Education Seminar
EDU 270	Educational Technology and Curriculum Integration
EDU 271	Introduction to Teaching
EDU 272	Educational Psychology
EDU 273	Introduction to Special Education
EDU 274	ESL Foundations
EDU 275	Classroom Management
EDU 281	Structure English Immersion Methods
EDU 290	Internship

Unless otherwise specified, review team comments reflect findings in both the Post Baccaalaureate Teacher Certification Program Secondary Education and the Post-Baccalaureate Teacher Certification Program Elementary Education programs.

Program/Course sequence	Met ☒	Unmet ☐
Meets certification requirements	Met ☒	Unmet ☐
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met ☐	Unmet ☒ EDU 290

Findings of the Team:

According to faculty and administration, the program consists of six Foundation Courses covering Educational Technology, Introduction to Teaching, Educational Psychology, Introduction to Special Education, ESL Foundations and Classroom Management. Six methods courses including Structure English Immersion are included in the elementary program sequence. A single content methods course, Secondary Teaching Methods (EDU 285), is included in the secondary program sequence. Coursework is followed by an eight (8) hour Student Internship (capstone experience). Foundation courses are intended to provide students with underlying professional knowledge. Students must complete at least 12 hours in Foundation coursework before being formally admitted to the programs. According to faculty and administration, in reality, students are required to complete 13 hours of Foundation courses.

Faculty and administration reported that each course has six modules. However, internet access to all six modules was not provided to the review team.

The courses observed demonstrated the incorporation of "best practice" online materials, such as the Annenberg Education Training Video series.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): Three years of verified teaching experience in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

If students are scaffolding their knowledge as evidenced in the faculty philosophy articulated during faculty interviews, it is important that a recommended sequence of courses be clearly identified by the College.

Evidence used for decision:

- Course sequence
- Interviews with faculty and administration

If Unmet, further action required:

Assign a unique coursework number (EDU 290) for student teaching to each program.

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met ☒	Unmet ☐
Course description	Met ☒	Unmet ☐
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met ☒	Unmet ☐
Alignment to national standards	Met ☐	Unmet ☒
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met ☒	Unmet ☐
Competencies clearly identified	Met ☒	Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Inconsistencies were identified between print/online syllabi submitted in Step 2 and documentation provided to the Team during the site visit. The team was provided with course-specific information in at least three different formats:

1. Coursework submitted in the Step 2 Program Report contained course descriptions aligned to the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards (ATPS) (at the "standards" level) and a topical outline.

2. Syllabi provided in hard copy during the on-site review included required textbooks, course descriptions, course performance objectives, course outlines, course requirements and basic course information. Standards alignment was not apparent on the majority of the printed syllabi.

3. Online versions of the two representative courses provided to the review team (EDU 274 ESL Foundations and EDU 275 Classroom Management). EDU 274 was aligned to State standards at the standards level, but the performance objectives for EDU 275 were not aligned.

Objective language used within the two representative sets of modules provided the review team did not match the broader performance objective language for the corresponding coursework.

All of the academic content areas require secondary education candidates to enroll in a single methods course (EDU 285).

Alignment to National standards (INTASC) was not evident except for the artifacts listed on the Program Matrix.

The objectives identified for EDU 268 appear very rigorous for a one credit introductory course (i.e. Identify and utilize best classroom practices; and write a comprehensive and effective lesson plan.)

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

According to faculty and administration, many students enroll in Foundations courses to explore the possibility and personal fit of a career in education. It is recommended that faculty reiterate the initial 12-13 credit hour requirement for formal admission to the program.

Within the online syllabi listing of assignments, identify the corresponding module number with each assignment and include the artifact assignments within the assignment listing.

For clarity in student understanding, include the standards alignment within each module for each course.

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 documentation
- Student Handbook
- Website
- Syllabi
- Interviews with campus administration, program administrator and instructional designer
- Interviews with current students and alumni
- Interviews with faculty

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and revise, if necessary, online syllabi to ensure that performance objectives, benchmark/signature assignments are clearly identified using standards-based language and that all performance objectives are coded to the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards at the performance and indicator levels.

Align all performance objectives to the INTASC standards.

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course   Met ☐ Unmet ☒ (See comments below.)

Align with evidence on program matrix   Met ☒ Unmet ☐ (See comments below.)

Findings of the Team:

The faculty reported the program contained twenty (20) artifacts (benchmark/signature) assignments. The review team was able to review only twelve artifacts and they were clearly defined.

EDU 290 Artifact 13, A Two-Week Integrated Unit,   EDU 272 Artifact 3, Comparing Developmental Attributes and Educational Implications and all artifacts for EDU 270 were outstanding in their potential to assess a student's course and demonstrate competency in meeting State and National Standards.

Some artifacts did not measure competency of the standard indicated (i.e. Artifacts 6 and 10 required creation of an annotated bibliography and Artifact 7 requires interviewing and observing teachers). These represent activities that support construction of knowledge regarding performance objectives and /or standards. This type of student benchmark assignment does not assess student competency in relation to performance objectives and State and National Standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Reflect on the rigor of the benchmark assignments pertaining to their efficacy in providing sufficient evidence to ensure student's mastery of course competencies and State and National Standards.

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 documentation
- Syllabi
- Program Matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and revise, if necessary, to ensure that all benchmark assignments are clearly identified using standard based language and aligned with State and National Standards on the Program Matrix.

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment   Met ☒   Unmet ☐

Clearly identified criteria   Met ☒   Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

A rubric has been designed for scoring student performance on artifacts in the syllabi provided for review.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi

If Unmet, further action required:

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience") ARS R7-2-604   Met ☒   Unmet ☐ (See comments below)

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)   Met ☒   Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences   Met ☒   Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Three of the Foundation courses require ten practicum hours (EDU 273, EDU 274 and EDU 275).

Methods courses prior to the Student Internship require fifteen hours h of practicum experiences.

Practicum components include observations, hands-on activities and lesson plan development and implementation.

Each practicum course includes specific clearly-delineated assignments.

According to faculty and administration, the community provides a wise range of diverse environments for student placements in field experiences. However, there is no evidence of accountability for diversity in field experiences. Interview with faculty and students indicated that not all students participate in a variety of diverse placements; for instance, students have been allowed to remain or choose the same mentor teacher for three or more field experiences.

During the student interviews, students reported that "practicum made online courses come alive"; "The practicum and online courses were a perfect marriage." Another student remarked, "I was able to immediately connect coursework to practicum experiences."

During the interviews with mentors, one individual stated that she had three outstanding practicum students. They were exciting an motivated – more than she has seen with younger students. Another individual stated that she had two practicum students who were superior. They were anxious to engage and not just watch. I hope we can hire the two of them. One of the mentors talked about appreciating the focus of the practicum assignments.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Strengthen the assessment component (evaluation) of practicum experiences through continued attention to the design and implementation of assignment-specific rubrics.

Review the practicum activities to ensure that all identified practicum activities meet the State Board definition for field experience.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Step 2 documents
- Student handbook
- Interviews with mentor teachers and LEA administrator
- Interview with practicum Coordinator

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards   Met ☐   Unmet ☒

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards   Met ☐   Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria   Met ☒   Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Evaluation instruments are not tied to State and National Standards.

The evaluation instrument for field experiences prior to the capstone experience does not address identified academic competencies, but assesses dispositions.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Strengthen the assessment component (evaluation) of practicum experiences through continued attention to the design and implementation of assignment-specific rubrics.

Align field experience evaluation instrument with Student Internship Evaluation instrument.

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 documentation
- Syllabi
- Interview with Practicum Coordinator

If Unmet, further action required:

Align evaluation instruments with State and National Standards.

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified   Met ☒   Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies,   Met ☒   Unmet ☐
benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and
rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Findings of the Team:

The capstone experience referred to as Student Internship consists of nine weeks with a certified teacher who has at lease three years of teaching experience.

During the Student Internship, Interns prepare weekly reflection logs, develop and implement lesson plans, communicate with parents, assess students and develop and implement a two-week integrated unit.

Printed materials provided the Review Team members differ in identifying the length of the Internship experience (9 weeks vs. 12 weeks).

The Program Coordinator meets personally with each intern and cooperating teacher to review the expectations provided in the Student Internship packet.

Cooperating teachers and the LEA administrator stated, "My intern was so fantastic and so prepared, it {the experience} was like team-teaching;" Students are well-prepared for the experience. I regretted losing an intern from my school, but another institution beat me to the punch."

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Step 2 documents
- Student Handbook
- Interview with mentor teachers and LEA administrator
- Interview with Internship Coordinator

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met ☐	Unmet ☒
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met ☐	Unmet ☒
Clearly identified criteria	Met ☒	Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

70% mastery was the percentage established for a successful Internship experience.

Data from the formal evaluations show that seventy-seven student interns participated in the Internship experience from spring of 2004 through Spring 2006; 4/77 (5%) achieved less than 70%; 9/77 (11%) achieve less than 80%; and 57/77 (74) achieved 90% or higher.

The mid-term evaluation and the final evaluation are not aligned to State and National Standards, even though the criteria appeared to be aligned.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Additional training for the cooperating teachers, specifically on the capstone assessment instruments.

Increase the percentage established for completion of a successful internship.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Step 2 documents
- Student Handbook
- Interview with Internship Coordinator

If Unmet, further action required:

Align mid-term and final evaluation instruments with State and National Standards.

PROGRAM MATRIX

The Program Matrix I a critical component of the program review process; these matrices identify how the institution teaches (through field experience and coursework) and assess a candidate's competency on state and national standards. In addition, the institution must have evidence that supports this alignment.

Findings of the Team:

All artifacts do not appear on the program matrix.

Because the artifacts were placed on the Program Matrix based on their perceived alignment with the INTASC Standards, their placement with relation to the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards may not be appropriate. The designated alignment for Artifacts 2, 13, 16 and 17 appeared inappropriate.

Some artifacts did not measure competency of the standard indicated (i.e. Artifacts 6 and 10 required creation of an annotated bibliography and Artifact 7 required interviewing and observing teachers). These represent activities that support construction of knowledge regarding performance objectives and /or standards. This type of student benchmark assignment does not assess student competency in relation to performance objectives and State and National Standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:
- Program Matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Resubmit Program Matrix.

See program approval timeline for resubmission of Program Matrix.

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's   Met ☒   Unmet ☐
competency in meeting state and national standards

Findings of the Team:

Three years of data (August 2004 thought April 207) on the artifacts was reported in this Report within the benchmark section.

Three years of data (spring 2004 through spring 2007) on competency attainment for the interns was reported in this Report within the Benchmark section.

Record-keeping processes involved students uploading assignment results to Task Stream. Printed copies of completed student artifacts were available to the review team. Student artifacts appeared to be of "high quality" and INTASC based. Samples of student Direct Response portfolios were not available for viewing.

Data was provided for eleven benchmark assignments. From August, 2004 to August, 2007, the lowest percentage of students who met the identified competencies was 91%.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 documents
- Program Matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ *Three (3) Year Approval*

- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules

- **All** core program components present

- Matrix provides **sufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards.

To extend the valid program approval to five years, the institution must submit to the Arizona Department of Education no later than

90 days prior to the expiration of the program approval the following documents:

- Course sequence

- Revised course syllabi that reflect alignment with State and National Standards at the standard and indicator levels.

- Updated program matrix that provides evidence of how state and national standards are being addressed related to coursework, field experiences and assessments to determine a candidate's competency in meeting the standards;

- Two additional years of data related to candidates' competency in meeting the standards based on coursework, field experiences and assessments identified in the program matrix.

PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

The Review Team was impressed with the design, comprehensiveness, implementation, and effectiveness of the online program.

The faculty has clearly devised effective ways to connect and engage with their students.

The faculty and staff have made it a priority to be service oriented and to meet the needs of the community. Involvement of the LEA leadership is commended.

The rapid growth of the grogram will require a commitment to maintain the goals already established.

Continue with the plan to design a survey to track Pima Community College graduates.

Students selected Pima Community college for a wide-range of positive factors.

Program Name: Special Education Cross-Categorical Certification

Special Education Learning Disabilities Certifciation

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The Post Degree Teacher Certification programs in Cross-categorical and Learning Disabilities are designed to meet the need for special education teachers in Arizona. Due to the large number of uncertified special education teachers in Arizona, we believe our primary market will be students who are interested in participating in ADE's alternative certification TPP intern program. As a result, we have designed the programs so students take four (4) 1-credit courses that provide "just in time" training prior to entering the K-12 Classroom as certified Interns. The programs will be open to all post-degree students interested in special education certification; however, the focus is TPP.

Pima Community College withdrew the original submissions for Dual Certification Elementary/Special Education Cross-categorical, Dual Certification Elementary/Learning Disability, Dual Certification Secondary Education/Cross-categorical, and Dual Certification Secondary Education/Learning Disability and resubmitted a revised proposal on May 11, 2007. The two programs submitted were Special Education Cross-categorical Teacher Certification and Special Education Learning Disabilities Teacher Certification. A follow-up meeting was held with three review team members and Dr. Cynthia McCafferty, Cynthia Yrun-Calenti, and Brian Nelson from Pima Community College on June 7, 2007 to review continued concerns. The final program submission for Special Education Cross-categorical Teacher Certification and Special Education Learning Disabilities Teacher Certification was submitted to the Arizona Department of Education on July 11, 2007 via email from Dr. Cynthia McCafferty. Reviewer comments are based on the May 11th and July 11th, 2007 submissions and review team and Pima Community College faculty and administration dialogue.

Program/Course sequence   Met ☒   Unmet ☐

Meets certification requirements   Met ☒   Unmet ☐

Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)   Met ☐   Unmet ☒ (EDU 290)

Findings of the Team:

The program sequence is divided into foundations, methods, methods electives, and internship. Twenty hours of foundations courses must be completed prior to enrollment in the methods courses according to interviews with faculty and administration. Four of the foundations courses are one hour courses (EDS 250, EDS 251, EDS 252 and EDS 253).

Required special education courses for the Cross-categorical certification include:

Survey of Special Education (EDS 256)	3 credit hours
Foundations of Instruction: Cross-categorical (EDS 258A)	2 credit hours
Diagnosis and Assessment of Students with Learning Disabilities (EDS 257)	3 credit hours
Teaching Methods: Cross-categorical (EDS 259)	3 credit hours

Electives:

Issues in Special Education (EDS250)	1 credit hour
Legal Issues in Special Education (EDS 251)	1 credit hour
Understanding Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (EDS 252)	1 credit hour
Development and Implementation of IEPs (EDS 253)	1 credit hour
Classroom Management for Special Education (EDS 254)	2 credit hours
Developmental Reading, Instruction, Assessment and Remediation (EDS 260)	3 credit hours
Assistive Technology for Special Education Teachers (EDS 255)	3 credit hours

The required coursework and electives meet the State Board requirement of 21 hours of special education coursework.

Required special education courses for the Learning Disability certification include:

Survey of Special Education (EDS 256)	3 credit hours
Foundations of Instruction: Learning Disability (EDS 258B)	2 credit hours
Diagnosis and Assessment of Students with Learning Disabilities (EDS 257)	3 credit hours
Learning Disabilities-Methods (EDS 261)	3 credit hours

Electives:

Issues in special Education (EDS250)	1 credit hour
Legal Issues in Special Education (EDS 251)	1 credit hour
Understanding Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (EDS 252)	1 credit hour
Development and Implementation of IEPs (EDS 253)	1 credit hour
Classroom Management for Special Education (EDS 254)	2 credit hours
Developmental Reading, Instruction, Assessment and Remediation (EDS 260)	3 credit hours
Assistive Technology for Special Education Teachers (EDS 255)	3 credit hours

The required coursework and electives meet the State Board requirement of 21 hours of special education coursework.

All candidates are required to enroll in two methods electives:

Content Area Reading (EDU255)	3 credit hours
Elementary Science Methods and Curriculum Development (EDU 278)	3 credit hours
Elementary Math Methods and Curriculum Development (EDU 279)	3 credit hours
Secondary Teaching Methods (EDU 285)	3 credit hours

All students are required to complete an 8 credit hour Student Internship in the designated disability areas. Cross-categorical certification requires the candidate to complete a student teaching assignment in 3 of the 5 designated disability areas (MR, ED, LD, OI/OHI).

Students also meet the requirement for the full SEI endorsement upon completion of the program of study (EDU 274 and EDU 281).

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): Three years of verified teaching experience in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Monitor closely through student surveys and interviews the four (4) training courses (EDS 250, EDS 251, EDS 252 and EDS 253) and the two hour foundations courses (EDS 258 A and EDS 258B) to determine if the coursework is meeting students' needs and expectations.

Evidence used for decision:

- May 11th and July 11th, 2007 submissions
- Interviews with faculty and administration

If Unmet, further action required:

Assign a unique coursework number for student teaching (EDU 290).

All syllabi provided	Met ☒	Unmet ☐
Course description	Met ☒	Unmet ☐
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met ☒	Unmet ☐ (See comments below)
Alignment to national standards	Met ☒	Unmet ☐ (See comments below)
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met ☒	Unmet ☐
Competencies clearly identified	Met ☒	Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

A standardized format was followed for syllabi, which consisted of a description, performance objectives, course outline, instructional materials including required texts and websites, course information,TaskStream artifacts and rubrics.

Alignment occurred for Arizona Professional Teaching Standards at the indicator level and for the CEC Standards at the standard level. Many indicators seemed to lack correlation to the specified performance objective. For example, the syllabus for EDS 250 specifies "1. Identify and discuss issues which impact the distinction between 'special' education and 'general' education." (AZ 6.1) However, AZ 6.1 deals with professional development. This overgeneralization occurs throughout the program.

The performance objectives for EDS 258A, Foundatons of Instruction: Cross-categorical and EDS 258 B were aligned to the CEC and INTASC Standards at the performance level, but were not aligned to the Arizona Teaching Standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

All performance objectives should be reviewed for alignment with appropriate State and National Standards.

Evidence used for decision:

- May 11th and July 11th submissions
- Program Matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course   Met ⊠   Unmet ☐

Align with evidence on program matrix   Met ⊠   Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Based on discussions between the review team members and Pima Community College faculty and administration, benchmark assignments will not be used to assess program competency in the four 1 credit training courses.

Review team members expressed concern over the relevancy and rigor of identified benchmark assignments. For example, in EDS 255, which focuses on assistive technology, the student is required to complete a benchmark/signature assignment that consists of a PowerPoint presentation on professional development with respect to assistive technology, which the student is to submit to the instructor who will serve as "potential employer and provide you with feedback." Demonstrating the use or application of an assistive technology for a student with a disability seems like a more reasonable outcome that would also allow the program participant to demonstrate competency with respect to the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards.

As indicated in the course description, these programs are designed for candidates already working in the classroom rather than those who are new to the education profession. The course sequence does not appear to reflect a continuum of learning nor a scaffolding of course content and skills for students who do not meet this criterion. For example, EDS 256, Survey of Special Education is the seventh course in the program. The TaskStream assignment identified in EDS 256, Survey of Special Education, seems to be more appropriate for EDS 255, Assistive Technology. The Arizona Professional Teaching Standards identified are irrelevant to the assignment. Additionally, program participants are required to write IEPs in EDS 258, but this comes immediately after EDS 256, Survey of Special Education, when students have insufficient background. Although the one credit training courses were developed in response to district needs, these one hour training courses may not be appropriate for beginning educators who are not "teacher of record".

The courses and field experiences where the Arizona Professional Teaching Standard are assessed are noted on the Program Matrix. Generally the artifact does not measure the candidate's competence to perform relative to the Arizona Professional Teaching Standard and results in inconsistencies in attempting to assess the critical student performance to determine the effectiveness of the program and the impact program participants are likely to make on K-12 pupils.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Create an Aligning Practicum to Theory matrix for each course.

Review each practicum activity to select a rigorous and relevant practicum activity that assesses a candidate's competency in meeting State and National Standards.

Review and revise Program Matrix to reflect changes in benchmark assignments.

Monitor closely through student surveys and interviews the four (4) training courses (EDS 250, EDS 251, EDS 252 and EDS 253) and the two hour foundations courses (EDS 258 A and EDS 258B) to determine if the coursework is meeting students' needs and expectations.

Evidence used for decision:

- May 11th and July 11th submissions
- Interviews with faculty and administration

If Unmet, further action required:

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment   Met ☒   Unmet ☐

Clearly identified criteria   Met ☒   Unmet ☐ (See comments below)

Findings of the Team:

Assignment rubrics, discussion rubrics, quiz rubrics and Task Stream artifact rubrics were provided as evidence to the review team.

TaskStream artifacts were consistently worth 50 points in all courses. There were four criterion levels, which were differentiated - outstanding, good, adequate and poor. Levels of performance and anchor statements were identified.

There was not a uniform system for benchmark assignments. In particular, criteria varied from assignment to assignment. For example, EDS 255 had creativity, graphics and visual appeal, whereas most assignments included criteria such as critical thinking, artifact elements and quality of writing.

Assignments were not focused on performance assessment, but on searching the internet, PowerPoint presentations, etc. For example, in EDU 281—Structured English Immersion Methods, students are asked to search for five informal and five formal assessment instruments and include these instruments in their portfolio. This is inconsistent with requirements in Arizona where teachers are required to use the AZELLA to assess English language proficiency.

The major concern of the review team was the lack of emphasis on content that is consistent with the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards and the CEC Standards. Rubrics tended to emphasize mechanics and organization rather than content and application appropriate to the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards and the CEC Standards. The rubrics did not appear to measure the candidate's competency in meeting State and National Standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Review rubrics and revise to reflect a consistent format.

Review rubrics to reflect performance levels and anchor statements that measure a candidate's competency in meeting State and National Standards.

Review points assigned to assignments, discussions, quizzes and TaskStream artifacts for consistency between syllabi and to ensure that passage of the course and demonstration of a candidate's competency in meeting State and National standards are consistent.

Evidence used for decision:

- May 11th and July 11th program submissions
- Dialogue with Pima Community College faculty and administration

If Unmet, further action required:

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience") ARS R7-2-604

Met ☒   Unmet ☐ (See comments below.)

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)   Met ☒   Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences   Met ☒   Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

All field experiences use the three-tiered approach consisting of observation, hands-on opportunities, mentor cycles/feedback and lesson plan implementation.

Field experiences are tied to course descriptions and performance objectives.

Two foundations courses require 10 hours each of field experience (EDS 256 and EDS 254)—observation for 3 hours, hands on activities for 5 hours, mentor cycles for 1 hour and lesson plan implementation for 1 hour. The seven methods course require 15 hours each of field experience—observation for 3 hours, hands on activities for 10 hours, mentor feedback for 1 hour, and lesson plans for 1 hour.

All field experience (practicum) activities were not consistent with State Board definitions for field experiences. For example, EDS 254 lists six practicum activities, but only practicum activities 2, 5 and 6 meet the State Board definition of field experience. In SPE 256, ten activities are to be performed in 15 hours of field experience. Of the ten activities, only activities 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 meet the field experience definition established in State Board guidelines.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Review all field experience activities to ensure they meet the State Board definition of field experience.

Consider creating a Practicum to Theory matrix, as you did for EDS 254, for the remainder of the courses.

Evidence used for decision:

- May 11th and July 11th submissions
- Interviews with faculty and administration

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards   Met ☐   Unmet ☒

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards   Met ☐   Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria   Met ☒   Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The mentor feedback form is a 3 point Likert Scale (Exceeds Standard, Meets Standard and Needs Improvement) that focuses on disposititions. Explicit anchor statements are not present.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Review and revise Mentor Feedback form to align with Student Teaching Evaluation instrument(s).

Evidence used for decision:

- May 11th and June 11th submissions

If Unmet, further action required:

Align the field experience evaluation instrument with State and National Standards.

Design a rubric indicating levels of performance and explicit anchor statements that clearly define the expected performance levels.

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified   Met ☒   Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies,   Met ☒   Unmet ☐
benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and
rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Findings of the Team:

A SPED Student Internship Checklist is provided each student

Students are provided an *Integrated Unit Handbook* as the development of an integrated unit is critical to the Student Teaching Internship. It is not clear how the integrated unit requirement is explicitly related to the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards and the CEC Standards since a rubric for scoring the integrated unit was not provided to the Review Team.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Design a scoring rubric for the integrated unit that clearly indicates levels of performance with explicit anchor statements.

Design a scoring rubric to include explicit anchor statements for each performance level.

Evidence used for decision:

- May 11th and July 11th submissions
- Interviews with faculty and administration
- Integrated Unit Handbook

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met ☐	Unmet ☒
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met ☐	Unmet ☒
Clearly identified criteria	Met ☒	Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The capstone experience referred to as Student Internship consists of nine weeks with a certified teacher who has at lease three years of teaching experience.

During the Student Internship, interns prepare weekly reflection logs, develop and implement lesson plans, communicate with parents, assess students and develop and implement a two-week integrated unit.

The alignment between course objectives listed for EDS 290 and the evaluation instruments used for student teaching is lacking.

The lesson critique is limited in scope, assessing only a portion of Arizona Professional Teaching Standard #1 and #8. This assessment is scored on a yes or no basis.

The mid-term and final evaluation forms appear to be aligned to the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards and CEC Standards and the objectives for the course are consistent with the Standards. However, the mid-term and final evaluation forms should explicitly state the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards and indicators and CEC Standards that are being assessed. For example, the "Planning (Lesson)" section is aligned to Arizona Professional Teaching Standard #1, the "Assessment" section is aligned to Arizona Professional Teaching Standard #4, and Arizona Professional Teaching Standards 2, 3 , 6, and 7 are also taken into account in this evaluation instrument.

Lack of explicit anchor statements for each performance level indicator in the rubrics result in subjectivity when evaluating student work samples.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and align all Student Internship evaluation instruments to the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards at the indicator level and the CEC Standards.

Review and revise rubrics to include explicit anchor statements for each performance level.

The Program Matrix is a critical component of the program review process; these matrices identify how the institution teaches (through field experience and coursework) and assess a candidate's competency on State and National Standards. In addition, the institution must have evidence that supports this alignment.

Findings of the Team:

The Program Matrix submitted on July 11th clearly indicates coursework and field experiences where the State and National Standards are assessed.

Artifacts for determining candidate competency are clearly identified.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Review all benchmark assignments to ensure that the selected artifacts align with the State and National Standards and represent the rigor necessary for determining candidate's competency in meeting the identified standard.

Evidence used for decision:

- May 11th and July 11th submissions
- Program Matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's   Met ☒   Unmet ☐
competency in meeting state and national standards

Findings of the Team:

A plan for gathering and analyzing data was submitted.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- May 11th and July 11th submissions

If Unmet, further action required:

Submit data as required by program approval timeline.

☒ *Two (2) Year Approval*

- **New Program**

To extend the valid program approval to five years, the institution must submit to the Arizona Department of Education no later than 90 days prior to the expiration of the program approval the following documents:

- Course sequence;

- Coursework syllabi that align with State And National Standards and Indicators;

- Coursework syllabi that identify benchmark assignments with corresponding rubrics for assessing candidate's competency;

- Updated <u>Program Matrix</u> that provides <u>evidence</u> of how state and national standards are being addressed related to coursework, field experiences and assessments to determine a candidate's competency in meeting the standards;

- <u>One year</u> of <u>data</u> related to candidates' competency in meeting the standards based on coursework, field experiences and assessments identified in the Program Matrix. Data needs to include results from student surveys and interviews regarding the four (4) 1 hour training courses and the two hour foundations courses identified in previous review team comments.